

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Egbert Classen et al.
Application Number: 10/583,637
Filing Date: August 3, 2007
Group Art Unit: 2833
Examiner: Brigitte R. Hammond
Title: CONNECTOR DEVICE FOR PRODUCING AN
ELECTRICAL CONNECTION BETWEEN A MAINS CABLE
AND A LOOM

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

In reply to the Examiner's Answer dated June 17, 2011, Appellants submit this Reply Brief under 37 C.F.R. §41.41.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Examiner initially contends that "Appellant recites no structure for the identical connector configuration." In the next paragraph, the Examiner acknowledges that the claim defines "an identical connector configuration for each of the different mains cables." The claimed *structure* amounts to a connector configuration, i.e., structure that is capable of being connected, that is identical for each of different mains cables. Regardless of this interpretation, as noted previously, the connector 70 in Judge does not serve as an electrical connector between a mains cable and a cable harness. Additionally, Judge is silent with regard to a plug connector for a plurality of different mains cables.

With regard to claim 8, Appellants submit that those of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate the difference between a casing being "substantially water-resistant" and a casing being waterproof.

With regard to Machado, the Examiner still fails to identify structure in Machado that

meets the claimed first plug-in connector including connection elements coupleable to the cable harness that effect a detachable mechanical and electrical connection between the first plug-in connector and the cable harness. In this context, the Examiner maintains that “the terms detachable/coupleable just mean that the structure be able to be coupled/detached.” The structure defined in the claims, however, does not relate merely to detaching and coupling one structure to another; rather, the claims specifically define a mechanical and electrical connection between specifically defined components.

The Examiner further contends that Machado discloses a mains adapter . . . that effects a detachable mechanical and electrical connection between a first plug-in connector and a cable harness. As noted previously, however, the Machado structure serves to sever an electrical connection.

Still further, the connection system defined in claim 24 embodies a connector device including a connection for a plurality of different mains cables with an identical connector configuration for each of the plurality of different mains cables. Machado lacks any reference to a plurality of mains cables.

For the reasons discussed herein and in the Appeal Brief, reversal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andre Pallapies/

Andre Pallapies
Registration No. 62,246
August 5, 2011

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-672-7927
Fax: 714-845-2807
andre.pallapies@bshg.com